

Egyptian medical ideas and their possible influence on Herophilus and the other Greek doctors who practised in Alexandria by Egypt in the third century BC.

The prefatory discussions are perhaps the most valuable of all, for they relate Herophilus to a much wider context. They offer judicious surveys of the development of Greek anatomy (von Staden rightly emphasizes the frontier colonialism of early Alexandria, and accepts the tradition that Herophilus and Erasistratus vivisectioned criminals), therapeutics, ophthalmology, pharmacology, and Hippocratic exegesis (where he rightly insists, against Wesley Smith, on the importance of Herophilus in the tradition of Hippocratic commentary). If at times von Staden's careful analysis of all possible hypotheses makes one wish for a punchier summary of Herophilus' achievements that less committed students might read, his self-discipline is a necessary warning of the fragility of theories based on disconnected fragments, and, occasionally, on others' misunderstandings. By laying the groundwork so carefully, he has made it possible for other historians to ask bigger and more profound questions about ancient medicine and about our knowledge of it. Together with Garofalo's similar, if less sophisticated, collection of *Erasistratea*, this book transforms the academic study of Hellenistic medicine. In more than one sense it provides the essential link between the Hippocratic Corpus and the Roman medicine of Rufus, Soranus, and Galen.

The few criticisms that follow in no way diminish this considerable achievement: T8 is better as a *dubium*; T134 and T221 are Renaissance fakes, depending, respectively, on T132 and T220; T197b, from a Renaissance author, probably depends on T197a; AP17–18 are ostensibly genuine, cf. Galen, XIV.687; HE14 hides a reference to Hippocrates, not Heraclides. It is unfortunate that von Staden was unable to include a new fragment from Galen, CMG Suppl. Or. IV, pp. 68–69, which lists Herophilus among doctors of distinction, as in T10 and T16. The significance of the inclusion of Herophilus (and other Herophileans) among the portraits in Vienna, med. gr. 1, and, although with less claim to attention, in Oxford, Bodley *e Museo* 19 (= MacKinney, no. 44), is missed. A medieval artist included Herophilus in his gallery of doctors in Dresden, Db 92–93, but without adding a name; and the note on T229 might have queried the traditional identification of a terracotta figure in the Naples Museum with Herophilus. The texts and translations are usually sound: at T75,4, read "lecanen" ("pot", an otherwise unknown [slang?] word for skull, but cf. "testa", "tête") for the unintelligible "mecanen"; and I still prefer von Arnim's punctuation of T280. The index mistakes the Hippocratic commentator Dioscorides of T270 for the more celebrated pharmacologist.

These minor corrections do not in any way detract from the value of this impressive work of (unfashionable) philological scholarship. It amply repays whatever effort the prospective reader is prepared to put in, and even the specialist will learn a great deal from it.

Vivian Nutton, Wellcome Institute

Arnaldi de Villanova opera medica omnia IV: Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine sive de flebotomia, edidit Luke Demaitre, et praefatione et commentariis hispanicis et anglicis instruxerunt Pedro Gil-Sotres et Luke Demaitre, Seminarium Historiae Scientiae Barchinone, University of Barcelona, 1988, 8vo, pp. 307, (paperback).

Under the careful eye of Luis Garcia Ballester, Juan Paniagua, and Michael McVaugh the project to edit the complete medical works of Arnald of Villanova proceeds slowly but surely. This project is especially to be applauded by historians of medieval medicine. At a time when there are precious few plans to bring out such major new editions in the field, this enterprise underlines the continuing need to make more accessible the manuscript sources of medicine in the Latin West. In focusing upon Arnald of Villanova the general editors are bringing to life a figure whose writings—as this new edition is making all the more apparent—touch upon nearly every major aspect of learned medicine in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Moreover, one cannot fail to be impressed by the care and attention that is being paid to each volume in the series, a series that is fast becoming a model of first-rate scholarship. This, the most recent volume in the series, is the fifth to appear so far. Another seven volumes are nearing

Book Reviews

completion, and when the project is complete it should comprise nineteen volumes in all. This volume is an edition of Arnald's *Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine sive flebotomia*. It contains a detailed introductory essay (in Spanish) by Pedro Gil-Sotres together with the text of Arnald's treatise on phlebotomy edited by Luke Demaitre. The volume is complete with bibliography and indices.

Gil-Sotres's excellent introduction begins with a detailed analysis of the nature of phlebotomy in terms of both its theory and practice (pp. 9–47). Here he outlines the theoretical assumptions derived from Galenic and Arabic sources that lay behind the art of blood-letting. In particular, he discusses the actions of derivation (the practice of withdrawing corrupt humours directly from the affected part of the body) and revulsion (the practice of reducing corrupt humours in one part of the body by acting upon another part). In his section on the indications and contra-indications of phlebotomy, Gil-Sotres examines the particular circumstances in which blood-letting is called for, together with their natural, non-natural and contra-natural causes. A detailed account of blood-letting is then given, including descriptions of the necessary preliminaries to blood-letting, the method of locating the vein, the art of incision, the different forms of phlebotomy, the quantity of blood to be let, complications that could occur, and the special care that had to be taken of a patient who had just been phlebotomized.

The second part of Gil-Sotres's introduction is given over to an analysis of the *Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine* itself (pp. 48–83). Here he discusses the date of the work, the occasion for its composition, and its sources. He examines the contents of the treatise from four perspectives. He views it, in turn, as an introduction to therapeutics, as a work on phlebotomy, and (probably most interesting of all) as an anti-Averroist medical text. He also argues that it can be interpreted as a polemic reflecting the author's part in at least three different disputes concerning the action of air on the humours, the treatment of pain, and the quantification of the amount of blood to be let. Gil-Sotres concludes his essay with an analysis of the discussions on phlebotomy to be found in Arnald's other writings (pp. 83–120), including the *Parabola* and the treatise *De simplicibus*. Under this heading he also includes works more doubtfully attributed to Arnald such as the short work entitled *Omni tempore* and the text beginning *Flebotomia est incisio vene*.

Luke Demaitre's critical edition of the *Tractatus de consideracionibus operis medicine* together with his prefatory note on the text and manuscripts of the *Tractatus* forms the second half of this volume (pp. 123–267). Demaitre explains that this edition provides a collation of the fourteen surviving manuscript copies of the work, eight of which date from the fourteenth century. As his base he has chosen to rely upon the fourteenth-century manuscript copy to be found in Paris, BN lat. 17847, fols 57r–87v, supplementing it with occasional emendations from another fourteenth-century manuscript copy, Oxford, Merton College 230, fols 33r–44v. Demaitre has wisely chosen not to record every minor variant reading which can often weigh down a critical apparatus with trivialities. Even so, those who turn to this volume in search of nothing more than a readable text may wish to quibble with Demaitre's policy of noting all the—sometimes strange—variant readings to be found in the six fifteenth-century manuscript copies, especially as he himself recognizes that these six copies are more corrupt than any of their predecessors. However, he rightly points out that this policy does help to highlight this very process of corruption, and reveals some of the connexions that can be drawn between the later copies.

In all, it is a joy to see the high standards adopted in the first volume of the Arnald of Villanova project being maintained here in the fifth.

Cornelius O'Boyle, Wellcome Unit, Cambridge

CHARLES B. SCHMITT, *Reappraisals in Renaissance thought*, ed. Charles Webster, Collected Studies Series, London, Variorum Reprints, 1989, 8vo, pp. 330, £34.00.

This collection of papers by Charles Schmitt (1933–1986) should be essential reading for every student of Renaissance medicine, science, and philosophy. Not least, because these today